

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, MAY 13, 2003

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, May 13, 2003, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON THURSDAY, MAY 15, 2003

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Wednesday, May 14, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. on Thursday, May 15, for the purpose of receiving in this Chamber former Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE A RECESS ON THURSDAY, MAY 15, 2003, FOR THE PURPOSE OF RECEIVING FORMER MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order on Thursday, May 15, for the Speaker to declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair for the purpose of receiving in this Chamber former Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 20

Mr. CHOCOLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 20.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. NANCY PELOSI, DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, DC, May 9, 2003.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House,
U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 5(a) of the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission Act (36 U.S.C. 101 note), I hereby appoint Representative LOUISE SLAUGHTER of New York and Representative JESSE JACKSON, Jr. of Illinois, to the Abraham Lincoln Bicentennial Commission for the 108th Congress.

Best regards,

NANCY PELOSI.

□ 1445

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HENSARLING). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. INSLEE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXCHANGE OF SPECIAL ORDER TIME

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take the Special Order time of the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

THE EFFECTS OF PASSING H.R. 2, JOBS AND GROWTH TAX ACT OF 2003

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, today we passed a bill out of here in an hour that spent \$550 billion worth of taxes. The fact that the House of Representatives, which is the body charged by the Constitution with the responsibility of originating all tax policy in this country, that we can deal with a bill of that size with 1 hour's debate is an absolute travesty. The Founders of this country never considered that a bill of that magnitude with those kinds of long-range effects would be consid-

ered on the back of galloping horses as we run to the airport to catch planes all over the country.

The theory of this bill is that if we give back taxes, somehow we will give it to people who will then invest it, creating jobs that will lead to employment in this country. We will hear over and over and over again we are going to create a million jobs, and all this kind of stuff. But the fact is that the Department of Commerce says that today our industries in this country are operating at 75 percent capacity. That means that they can make 25 percent more of whatever it is they make whether it is shirts or tables or furniture or automobiles. They have already the capacity to produce more goods.

What is not happening is that there are people there who have money to purchase those things. So the concept that we are going to give more to the people running the factory and that some factory owner is so stupid that he has already put out all of whatever he can make and thinks he can sell that he would now make more, he would get more machinery and open up a new building and make more automobiles or more whatever, it simply does not pass the commonsense test. If someone runs a bakery and they make 10 loaves of bread and their ovens will allow them to make 20 loaves of bread, but they only sell seven loaves of bread, why would they make 20 loaves of bread? Why would they hire another baker, buy more flour and more yeast and make more bread? So this theory that suddenly if we give more money to the people at the top will magically create jobs is absolutely nonsense. What is needed, obviously, is for the people at the bottom who buy things to have more money.

The bill we just passed out of here in an hour gave 80 percent of the benefit to people making more than \$75,000 a year. Now, \$75,000 a year is a pretty good income. One can do quite a bit with \$75,000 a year. But do all the people above it need more? Do they need to take 80 percent of the benefit and 20 percent goes to the people below? If one is a millionaire under that bill, they will get \$105,000 tax refund, \$105,000. What will these people on the bottom get? \$325.

Most people buy what they can afford, and if they have a small income, they sometimes cannot afford things so they do not buy them. When they have got a big income, they can do whatever they want. But this bill says these people over here with all the money, we are going to give them more, and these people over here, we are going to give them \$325.

There are many ways we could have written this bill. I had a proposal to give a payroll tax holiday. There were other proposals that were out here. But the point is that we needed a bill that was fair, that gave the money to the people at the bottom. I was prepared to give a \$1,400 amount to everybody in